DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 381 EA 003 779

AUTHOR DuVall, Charles R.
TITLE A Comparative Study of School Board Policies and Administrative Procedures for the Years 1965 and 1970 for Dealing With Supplementary Free Materials in School Districts in Cities With Populations Over 100,000 in the United States.
PUB DATE Apr 71
NOTE 57p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Policy; *Board of Education Policy; Boards of Education; *Resource Materials; School Districts; *School Industry Relationship; Supplementary Reading Materials
IDENTIFIERS *Supplementary Free Materials

ABSTRACT

This document reports on a study of (1) differences in school board policies between 1965 and 1970 concerning the use of supplementary free materials and (2) the administrative procedures used to implement those policies. Supplementary free materials are defined as those materials provided by businesses and governmental agencies free of charge to the teacher or the school system, or at a cost that includes only postage. The study revealed that in 1970 fewer boards had policies for dealing with supplementary free materials, and that there has been a shift in responsibility for determining their acceptability away from the building principal to the individual teacher. The criteria most commonly used for determining acceptability of supplementary free materials were (1) relevance, (2) educational significance, and (3) freedom from objectionable advertising. (JF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED056381

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SCHOOL BOARD POLICIES AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES FOR THE YEARS 1965 AND 1970 FOR DEALING WITH SUPPLEMENTARY FREE MATERIALS IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN CITIES WITH POPULATIONS OVER 100,000 IN THE UNITED STATES

---

by

Charles R. DuVall, Ph. D.

Associate Professor of Education

Indiana University at South Bend

EA 003 279

South Bend, Indiana

April, 1971

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The completion of a study of this kind depends upon the assistance and cooperation of many persons. The investigator wishes to thank the city school superintendents for the time and thought they have given to completing the questionnaire.

The writer is deeply appreciative of the assistance he received from Mr. David Slater in the initial compilation of the data.

C.R.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE PROBLEM, PROCEDURES, AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED	1
	Background	1
	The Problem	2
	Statement of the problem	2
	Importance of the study	3
	Methods of Procedure and Sources of Data	3
	Obtaining the population	3
	Design of the questionnaire	4
	Treatment of the data	4
	Limitations of the study	5
	Definitions of Terms Used	5
	Policies	5
	Procedures	5
	Supplementary free materials	5
	Others	6
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	7
	School Board Policies	7
	Administrative Procedures	9
	Supplementary Free Materials	11
	Summary of the Literature	13
III.	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	15
	Mailing and Receipt of Questionnaires	15
	Initial study	15
	Replication	15

CHAPTER PAGE

Reply by population size of city . . . 16

Analysis of Data 18

IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . 33

Summary 33

Review of the problem 33

Design of the study 34

Summary of the Findings 34

Conclusions 36

Recommendations for Further Study 37

BIBLIOGRAPHY 38

APPENDIX 42

Appendix A, Covering Letters and Questionnaires 43

Appendix B, Correspondence 50

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM, PROCEDURES, AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Background. For the past two decades or more there has been a great quantity of free and inexpensive supplementary materials available to teachers for use with their classes. The supplementary teaching aids have taken the form of booklets, pamphlets, films, film strips, cut-outs, and other such devices. They have been and are provided free, or at a minimal cost to teachers and school districts by local, state, and national governmental agencies, travel agencies, industries, businesses, and non-profit organizations.

An indication of the volume of the supplementary materials that are available to teachers is the availability of catalogs which list these materials. Some of these directories are: The Educators Grade Guide to Free Teaching Materials (25)*; a whole series of catalogs listing pamphlets, bulletins, film strips, movies, and tape recordings; and Free and Inexpensive Educational Aids (21)*.

Further, articles and monthly columns have appeared in magazines informing teachers of the availability of the most recent supplementary free materials. A selected

---

*Numbers in parentheses refer to numbered references in the bibliography; those after the colon are page numbers.

listing of these would include: "Teachers Service Bureau," in The Grade Teacher (26) and other listings in other professional journals too numerous to mention. Each of these columns has appeared monthly for several years, several contain postal card coupons which can be used by the teacher to check the desired materials to receive class quantities.

Additionally, there are specific pamphlet series which list sources of supplementary materials that can be obtained in different areas of study. One example of this type of pamphlet series is the World Affairs Guides by Kenworthy (12).

Finally, magazine articles have appeared with a degree of regularity citing sources where supplementary free materials could be obtained. One example of this type of article is "Free and Inexpensive Teaching Aids for Conservation Education" (6:35-48).

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. It was the purpose of this study to investigate the school board and/or administrative policies concerning, and administrative procedures for dealing with, supplementary free materials in all of the cities of the United States of 100,000 or more population. The study was conducted in 1965 and replicated in 1970. Changes in policy and implementation were noted.

Importance of the Study. Educational administrators have long been interested in the formulation of school board policies and in their implementation at the operational level. Today, the schools are subjected to more and more pressures to bring outside materials into the classroom. This study was intended, therefore, to add to the body of knowledge dealing with school board policies concerning the use of supplementary free materials, and the administrative procedures used to implement these policies. Further, it was replicated to determine if these policies and procedures had materially changed in the period 1965-70.

II. METHODS OF PROCEDURE AND SOURCES OF DATA

The purposes of this section were to describe: (1) the methods used in obtaining the populations; (2) the design of the questionnaires; and (3) the statistical treatment of the data.

Obtaining the population. The New Information Please Almanac, 1965 (10) and The New York Times Encyclopedic Almanac (15), were consulted in order to determine cities in the United States which had populations of 100,000 or more persons. A list of all of these cities was complied for both 1965 and 1970.

There were a total of 130 cities in the United States which, according to the 1960 census, had a population in excess of 100,000 persons. These were used in the 1965 study (10).

There were a total of 147 cities in the United States which were estimated to have populations of 100,000 or more persons. These were used in the 1970 study (15:198-205).

Questionnaires, together with a covering letter, were mailed to the school superintendents of these selected city school districts. A follow-up letter and questionnaire were mailed approximately one month later to those superintendents who had not responded to the initial request for information (Appendix A, pp. 43-46).

Design of the questionnaire. The initial questionnaire was designed with the help of Dr. Samuel I. Hicks, Director of the Ohio University Center for Educational Research and Service. The second questionnaire was only slightly modified on the basis of experience gained in the first study.

The purpose of these questionnaires was to elicit the following information: (1) to ascertain the existence of school board policies (written or unwritten)pertaining to supplementary free materials; (2) to determine the person(s) or group(s) who pass upon the acceptability of such materials and obtain them for the schools and school districts; (3) the criteria used for determining the acceptability of these materials; and (4) to obtain copies of written policies and administrative procedures used in implementing these policies in the individual school districts.

Treatment of the data. All data were analyzed and reported as a per cent of the total replies received to the

questionnaire. An additional analysis was made of the number of replies received by population size of the city.

III. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The limitations of any investigation conducted by the use of normative survey techniques existed in the initial study and the replication. A further limitation resulted from the fact that the reliability of both sets of data depended upon the accuracy with which the respondents (chief school administrators or their designated agent) responded to the instruments.

Further limitations may well be the difficulty in differentiating between board policies and administrative procedures.

IV. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

> Policies. A policy is a general statement of principle written in clear, concise language, providing the school administrator guidelines within which to operate. A policy statement reflects careful and deliberate study and has an enduring quality. . . . (22:6)

> Procedures. A procedure is a method by which a policy is achieved and is the means through which a desired goal may be attained. A statement on procedure usually gives the steps for achieving the objective stated in the policy. . . . procedure statements on the same general matter vary from place to place, because each statement must reflect the unique or peculiar conditions in the particular school system. (22:6)

Supplementary free materials. Materials available at no cost to the teacher or school system, or at a cost that

only includes postage, from businesses and governmental agencies. These materials may also be referred to as phantom or ephemeral materials.

Others. All other terms were defined as stated in Good's Dictionary of Education(8).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature which dealt with the area under study in these projects was divided into three distinct areas. The first area dealt with the formulation of school board policies and the second was the implementation of these policies through administrative procedures. The third area was concerned with a brief review of the magnitude of the use of supplementary free materials.

I. SCHOOL BOARD POLICIES

The power of a board of education to establish policies for the operation of schools is one of the rights and responsibilities vested in it by law. Greider, Pierce, and Rosenstengel wrote that in most states boards of education are granted great authority over school affairs in their districts. They note that one exception is the State of California where the Education Code is highly specific. These are powers not only of specific legal requirements, but also of a wide field of discretionary or implied powers (9:115-17).

One of the ways in which a board of education may function most effectively is through the enactment of policy statements for the guidance and direction of both the board and school personnel. These policies, when enacted, are the result of a great deal of planning (9:114-15).

Knezevich observed that "Policies are more likely to fulfill their potentials if reduced to writing", yet he went on to add that the development of a written policy statement was a relatively new phenomenon. Since the end of World War II studies have indicated that it was difficult to find a publication dealing with school board activity which failed to make reference to the need for written school board policies (14:224-25).

Moehlman compared written board policies to a yardstick by which all suggestions, recommendations, and procedures may be judged impersonally. He believed that many laymen and administrators tend to view written policies as constrictive and that they feel that they hamper action. He expressed his view of this belief as follows:

> . . . A more enlightened minority believe that a complete statement in printed form is not only an excellent device for vivifying the statutes and the practices from whence they are derived, but also as serving as an objective means for adjusting differences between community and schools, board of education, and executive personnel, and as an interpretive device (18:145-46).

Bretsch cited the Hayes and Nugent study concerning the relationships of boards of education and their superintendents. He stated that they "suggest that the superintendent's responsibilities are to execute the policies of the board and advise it on educational matters"(6:152).

Wynn wrote that:

> The primary functions of the board of education are legislative in nature. The board, with the advisement of the superintendent and his staff, establishes the

> policies and regulations which guide the school system in its operation. One of the most reliable hallmarks of a good board of education is the care with which it establishes and maintains policy. . . . Well-conceived policy statements tend to insure consistence of action, . . . The formulation of a policy statement is also a useful exercise in clarifying the school system's purposes and philosophy and translating them into a modus operandi. . . .(30:25).

II. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

The area of administrative procedures, which is referred to variously as the implementation of board policies, or "rules and regulations," is an area that is not at all clearly defined. This lack of definition is not at all surprising, and its existence does not come as a surprise to those engaged in educational administration.

Wynn stated

> The responsibility for the execution of policy should be delegated to the superintendent of schools and his staff. . . . Good organization requires a clear differentiation between the executive functions of the professional administrators of the school system and the legislative or policy-making functions of the board of education. However, in practice it is sometimes difficult to draw clearly the line between legislative and executive functions. . . .(30:25-26)

The Prentice-Hall Editorial Staff, writing in the

School Executives Guide, stated:

> Some of the records of board action found in the minute books can easily be identified as policies; others can be identified as rules or regulations for a board is functioning within its recognized sphere of activity when it approves the rules and regulations that are consistent with its policies. But frequently it is not easy to decide where the policy leaves off and rules and regulations begin. . . .(22:675-76)

The authors cited above go even further to clarify the above statement. They cited Polley as follows:

> . . . It is no great matter if some rules find their way in among policies . . . What one views as policy, another will view as a rule. Such variations are certainly acceptable. What is desired is a clear, concise statement of how the board intends to operate. Good form will help to bring this about but the goal is effective, efficient operation and not the form of the final document. (22:2)

Both Knezevich (14:255-57) and Greider, Pierce and Rosenstengel (9:121-23) believe that it is the duty of the superintendent of schools to implement the policies of the board through administrative procedures which will enable the professional staff to function effectively within the framework established by board policies. Goldhammer, in his book The School Board, clearly supports this viewpoint.(7:52-55)

The American Association of School Administrators presented a list of classified examples in an attempt to "clarify the distinction between legislative or policy-forming functions and executive functions" in their Twenty-fourth Yearbook (2:48-51). This list was illustrative of many common examples but was not intended to be complete or all-inclusive.

Lawson also dealt with the establishment of administrative policy in some detail. He delineated his definitions by the use of the terms "over-all school policies" and "internal policies". He included the area of the selection of instructional materials under the classification of internal policies, without any reference to the involvement

of the board of education in the matter (16:362-64). This appeared to be contrary to the recommendations presented by many of the other authors.

Mort and Ross discussed, indeed they gave special attention to, the matter of administrative discretion in the application of board policies. They stated:

> . . . Rules and procedures should be drafted wherever feasible in terms of the policies involved, leaving broad discretion to the administrators in their application.
>
> The amount of discretion needed will vary from subject to subject. For most rules individual administrators should be empowered to make exceptions. . . .
>
> Particularly is this needed in large school systems to forestall the tendency of principles to "pass the buck" to the central office, realizing that in only rare instances will the individual actually take the issue to the central office. (19:295)

III. SUPPLEMENTARY FREE MATERIALS

The use of supplementary free materials in the classrooms of schools throughout the United States appeared to be a fairly common practice.

Sinclair, in his study entitled A Report About Business-Sponsored Teaching Aids, reported:

> It is not possible to make an entirely complete and accurate summary based on the above information. Nonetheless it appears that . . . The average number of requests per week ranges from 8 in the case of one sponsor to 13,667 in the case of another. (24:46-47)

The assumption that educators have requested industry and government sponsored supplementary free materials appeared to be further substantiated by correspondence received by the author from various sources.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars distributed their materials to "approximately 700 different teachers each month through the year . . ."(13:Appendix B) while the French Government, through its ambassador, distributed over 7,000"teachers kits" during the year 1963.(29:Appendix B)

L. C. Jaynes, President of National Trailways Bus System noted:

> . . . concerning our Trailways Teachers Kits. This kit is provided free of charge to teachers requesting it. We have approximately 10,000 requests annually for these kits. (11:Appendix B)

Mr. R. O. Mertes, Director of School and College Service for United Airlines stated:

> . . . It will be impossible to give you respective letters - we receive upwards of 80,000 each year requesting our materials - and these automatically go to our mailing department for filling of requests etc. . . . (17:Appendix B)

Concerning the decision to use supplementary free materials, Sinclair reported the following:

> Findings indicate that in 401 (61.4 per cent) of the 626 schools or school systems represented in this study, the classroom teacher concerned decides which sponsored materials are to be used. It is to be noted, however, that more classroom teachers make this decision than should do so, in the educators' opinion. It is also recommended that more chairmen of departments and curriculum committees should help make the decision than are now asked to aid. . . . (24:45)

The National Science Teachers Association reported the following results of a survey conducted by them in 1960:

> Eighty-eight per cent of the respondents report a favorable attitude on the part of school authorities toward the use of business-sponsored teaching aids. Twelve per cent indicate an indifferent attitude. It is important to note that only one case of opposition is reported among 695 respondents . . .(20:29)

The American Association of School Administrators, in their booklet Choosing Free Materials for Use in the Schools, recommended that a school policy be established in order that the teacher might have proper guidelines in the selection of free materials. They cited such factors as the potential market represented by the captive audience of over 30 million children, and the obviously poor quality of some of the materials. (1;3-5;11-15)

IV. SUMMARY OF THE LITERATURE

School boards should establish broad policies covering the operation of the schools. These policies should be broad enough to give the school administrators who must operate under them operational latitude and flexibility. Board policies have not been adopted by all boards of education, and in many cases where they have been written and adopted they have not been periodically revised.

The area of administrative procedures, which is the implementation of board policies, is a field that is not at all clearly defined. In many cases it is difficult to determine what is policy and what is administrative procedure. However, it should be noted that in many cases this is not an important distinction. One area that should be given particular attention is the matter of administrative discretion in the application of baord policies in administrative procedures.

School systems and individual teachers throughout the

United States do seek out and use supplementary free materials. It has been recommended that school board policies be established to cover the acquisition and use of such materials, if such policies and procedures do not now exist.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purposes of this chapter were to present the results of the analysis if the data of (1) the mailing and return of the questionnaire and (2) the data obtained from the answers to the questionnaire itself.

I. MAILING AND RECEIPT OF QUESTIONNAIRES

Initial study. The questionnaire (Appendix A, pp.45-46) was enclosed together with a covering letter (Appendix A, p. 43) in an envelope addressed to the Superintendent of Schools in each of the cities in the United States of 100,000 or more population. These letters were mailed on March 15, 1965.

Approximately one month later (April 12, 1965) a second questionnaire was mailed, together with a covering letter (Appendix A, p.46) and a self-addressed stamped envelope to those superintendents of schools from whom no replies had been received by the date of the second mailing.

An 80 per cent response was received to this survey. This is considered to be sufficiently representative of the population to permit generalizations to be made from the data received.

Replication. The revised questionnaire (Appendix A, p48-49) was enclosed together with a covering letter (Appendix A,

p. 47)in an envelope addressed to the Superintendent of Schools in each of the cities of the United States of 100,000 or more population. These letters were mailed on May 8, 1970.

No follow-up letter was sent in this replecation of the study as it was not deemed to be necessary.

A 76 per cent response was received to this survey. This is considered to be sufficiently representative of the population to permit generalizations to be made and comparisons drawn with the previous study.

Reply by population size of city. Table 1 shows the number of questionnaires returned on the basis of the population size of the cities surveyed. Over half of the city school districts surveyed were in the population range of 100,000 persons but less than 200,000 persons in both 1965 and 1970. In this population range both the highest per cent of responses (1965 - 40.00 and 1970 -34.69) as well as the highest per cent of non-responses. Further examination of the data presented in Table 1 reveals that as the population size of the city increased the total per cent of participation in the study decreased. One notable exception to this was that in both 1965 and 1970 all cities whose population exceeded one million persons participated.

The analysis of responses to the questionnaire by population size of the cities was made to determine if there was any appreciable effect upon the results of the survey brought about by this factor. With one notable

TABLE 1. RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES CLASSIFIED BY POPULATION SIZE OF CITIES - 1965 AND 1970

Population Sizes	Year	Cities in Sample	Per Cent of Total	Resp. f	Per Cent of Total	Non-Resp. f	Per Cent of Total	Per Cent Resp: to Non-Resp.
100,000-	1965	69	53.08	52	40.00	17	13.08	75.36
199,999	1970	79	53.74	51	34.69	28	19.05	64.55
200,000-	1965	40	30.77	35	26.92	5	3.85	87.50
499,999	1970	42	28.57	38	25.85	4	2.72	90.48
500,000-	1965	16	12.30	12	9.23	4	3.07	75.00
999,999	1970	20	13.61	16	10.88	4	2.72	79.94
1,000,000	1965	5	3.85	5	3.85	0	0.00	100.00
or more	1970	6	4.08	6	4.08	0	0.00	100.00
Total	1965	130	100.00	104	80.00	26	20.00	80.00
	1970	147	100.00	111	75.51	36	24.49	75.50

exception (1970 - cities with populations of less than 200,000) a minimum of 75 per cent returns were received from all classifications by population size. Perhaps this one disparity might have been corrected had a follow-up letter been sent, however it is believed that the results of the study were not materially affected.

II. ANALYSIS OF DATA

The superintendents of schools were queried, in both 1965 and 1970, concerning the existence of a policy which dealt with supplementary free materials. In 1965 a total of 75 per cent of them responded that their school districts did have such a policy, while in 1970 slightly less than 60 per cent of them responded in the affirmative. In 1965 23 per cent of them replied that no such policy did exist while in 1970 approximately 35 per cent said that they had no such policy. Two and seven respondents respectively did not reply to this question in 1965, and 1970. These data are presented in Table 2.

An examination of Table 3 (page 20) indicates a wide disparity between the existence of policy (see Table 2) and the existence of written policy. In the 1965 survey 75 per cent of the superintendents indicated their districts did have a policy, only half of these indicated that it was written (37.50 per cent). Approximately the same ratio was in existence, as revealed by the 1970 survey. In this

TABLE 2. RESPONSE PERTAINING TO EXISTENCE OF BAORD POLICY CONCERNING FREE MATERIALS - 1965 AND 1970

Response	1965 f	1965 Per Cent of Total*	1970 f	1970 Per Cent of Total**
Yes	78	75.00	66	59.46
No	24	23.08	38	34.23
No response	2	1.92	7	6.31

* Total replies, 1965 = 104
**Total replies, 1970 = 111

Question: Does your school district have a policy pertaining to the selection of supplementary free materials for classroom use by teachers?

TABLE 3. RESPONSES PERTAINING TO EXISTENCE WRITTEN BOARD POLICIES CONCERNING FREE MATERIALS - 1965 AND 1970

Response	1965 f	1965 Per Cent of Total*	1970 f	1970 Per Cent of Total**
Yes	39	37.50	31	27.93
No	52	50.00	73	65.76
No response	13	12.50	7	6.31

* Total replies, 1965 = 104
** Total replies, 1970 = 111

Question: Is your policy concerning the selection and use of supplementary free materials a written policy?

replication approximately the same ratio was observed (59.46 affirmative responses to existence of policy and 27.93 per cent stated it was written). The per cent of non-respondents in 1970 was approximately one-half as great as in 1965, on this particular item.

In 1965 a total of 36 respondents enclosed written copies of their board policies and/or administrative procedures dealing with the use of supplementary free materials in their school districts. In 1970 a total of 25 such copies were received. An analysis of these written statements was made and they were found to be similar in many areas such as, materials must be: relevant and educationally significant; free of (objectionable advertising; and at the maturity level of the students. Significant changes in policies were noted in three areas: (1)less emphasis was placed on the non-controversial nature of materials (that is it was mentioned less frequently in the written policied received and analyzed); (2) a distinct change was noted that the demand was made that materials allow for differences of opinion, which would be expected in view of finding number one above; and (3) that materials must be free of "sectarian" viewpoints. Complete data are presented in Table 4.

The policy statements and/or administrative directives received in both surveys varied in length from one paragraph of approximately 100 words to complete booklets which spelled

TABLE 4. ANALYSIS OF WRITTEN BOARD POLICIES AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES SPECIFYING EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR SUPPLEMENTARY FREE MATERIALS - 1965 AND 1970

Response	Year	f	Per Cent of Respondents Answering*	Per Cent of Total Replies**
Relevant and educationally significant	1965	36	100.00	34.61
	1970	20	80.00	18.02
Free of (objectionable) advertising	1965	30	83.33	28.85
	1970	16	64.00	14.41
Non-controversial	1965	12	33.33	11.54
	1970	4	16.00	3.60
At maturity level of students	1965	7	19.44	6.73
	1970	6	24.00	5.41
Set up approved list	1965	7	19.44	6.73
	1970	3	12.00	2.70
Evaluation form provided	1965	7	19.44	6.73
	1970	3	12.00	2.70
Good format and physical features	1965	4	11.11	3.85
	1970	4	16.00	3.60
Initiative must come from school district	1965	4	11.11	3.85
	1970	2	8.00	1.81
Must allow for opinion differences	1965	3	8.33	5.41
	1970	6	24.00	5.41
Free from sectarian viewpoints	1965	2	5.56	1.92
	1970	11	44.00	9.91
Authorship shown	1965	2	5.56	1.92
	1970	2	8.00	1.81
On file in central office	1965	2	5.56	1.92
	1970	1	4.00	.90
Receipt and reviewing procedures establish.	1965	2	5.56	1.92
	1970	1	4.00	.90

TABLE 4. (Continued)

Response	Year	f	Per Cent of Respondents Answering*	Per Cent of Total Replies**
At readability level of students	1965	2	5.56	1.92
	1970	2	8.00	1.81
Screened and samples made available	1965	1	2.78	.96
	1970	2	8.00	1.81
No response	1965	65	--.--	62.50
	1970	78	--.--	70.27
"Yes" but no board policy enclosed	1965	3	--.--	2.88
	1970	8	--.--	7.21

** Total replies received, 1965 = 104
Total replies received, 1970 = 111

** Written policy statements received, 1965 = 36
Written policy statements received, 1970 = 25

out in considerable detail the manner in which supplementary free materials could be used by teachers and, in some cases, administrators. Some of thereplies from superintendents contained copies of their (districts) evaluative criteria and, in some cases, the forms which were employed by the professional staff in securing administrative approval (permission) to incorporate such supplementary free materials into the school system's curriculum.

Examination of the data presented in Table 5 revealed that over 90 per cent of the respondents in both 1965 and 1970 indicated that their school policy permitted the use of supplementary free materials by their teaching staffs. This, when contrasted with the data contained in Table 2 (page 19), led to the conclusion that more school districts permit the use of supplementary free materials than have a policy, either written or unwritten, dealing with the subject. These data would tend to support the belief that more superinetendents are aware of the existence and use of supplementary free materials than desire to have any policy regulating its use in the schools.

Examination of the data presented in both Tables 6 and 7 (pages 26 and 27) revealed that between the period of time of the surveys there had been a shift from the building principal as the person responsible, in the largest number of cases, for passing on the acceptability of supplementary free materials and also for obtaining such

TABLE 5. RESPONSES PERTAINING TO POLICY DEALING WITH USE OF SUPPLEMENTARY FREE MATERIALS BY TEACHERS WITH CLASSES - 1965 AND 1970

Response	1965 f	1965 Per Cent of Total*	1970 f	1970 Per Cent of Total**
Yes	94	90.38	103	92.79
No	3	2.89	1	.90
No response	7	6.73	7	6.31

* Total replies, 1965 = 104
** Total replies, 1970 = 111

Question: Does your policy permit the use of such free materials with their classes?

TABLE 6. PERSONS OR GROUPS WITHIN SCHOOL DISTRICTS WHO PASS UPON THE ACCEPTABILITY OF SUPPLEMENTARY FREE MATERIALS - 1965 AND 1970

Individual or Group	Year	f	Per Cent of Total
Building Principal	1965	60	57.69
	1970	69	62.16
Curr. Supervisor	1965	54	51.92
	1970	52	46.85
Asst. Supt./Instr.	1965	54	51.92
	1970	45	40.54
Individual Teacher	1965	51	49.09
	1970	79	71.17
Librarians	1965	26	25.00
	1970	38	34.23
City-wide Curr. Committee	1965	18	17.31
	1970	27	24.32
Building Curr. Committee	1965	10	9.62
	1970	19	17.12
Other:			
Committee on Mtls.	1965	6	5.77
	1970	1	.90
Director of Instr.	1965	4	3.86
	1970	3	2.70
Superintendent	1965	1	..96
	1970	1	.90
Other	1965	7	6.73
	1970	12	10.81
Totals	1965	18	17.31
	1970	17	15.31
No response	1965	6	5.77
	1970	10	9.01

Question: What person(s) or group(s) pass upon the acceptability of supplementary free materials?

TABLE 7. PERSONS OR GROUPS WITHIN SCHOOL DISTRICTS WHO OBTAIN AND DISTRIBUTE SUPPLEMENTARY FREE MATERIALS - 1965 AND 1970

Individual or Group	Year	f	Per Cent of Total*
Building Principal	1965	66	63.46
	1970	75	67.57
Curr. Supervisor	1965	63	60.58
	1970	68	61.26
Individual Teacher	1965	59	56.73
	1970	78	70.27
Asst. Supt./Instr.	1965	50	48.08
	1970	68	61.26
Librarians	1965	39	37.50
	1970	61	54.95
City-wide Curr. Committee	1965	17	16.35
	1970	35	31.53
Bldg. Curr. Comm.	1965	15	14.42
	1970	33	29.73
Other	1965	14	13.46
	1970	17	15.31
No response	1965	9	8.65
	1970	11	9.91

* Total replies, 1965 = 104
Total replies, 1970 = 111

Question: Supplementary free materials are obtained and distributed by:

materials to the individual classroom teacher. In the 1970 study this individual was responsible, in both instances, in over 70 per cent of the cases. The building principal was most often next designated in order, followed by the curriculum supervisor and the assistant superintendent for instruction. In many instances, as revealed by the data presented, there was more than one response checked to both of these questions, indicating a diversification of responsibility for determining the acceptability of supplementary free materials as well as the responsibility for obtaining and distributing them. It was clear that while many similarities do exist among school systems, there is also a great deal of disparity of thought and procedure in these matters.

Examination of the thirty-six written school board policies and/or administrative procedures received in 1965 and the twenty-five received in 1970, revealed that in 1965 the principal was given primary responsibility for evaluating and/or distributing supplementary free materials, while in 1970 this responsibility had shifted to the superintendent and/or his staff. The responsibility of committees of teachers had also changed in the five year period examined. In most cases the written procedures very carefully delineated and defined the responsibility and how such responsibility and the inherent decisions were to be implemented. However, multiple responses were tabulated from some policy statements,

TABLE 8. PERSONS OR GROUPS SPECIFIED IN BOARD POLICIES OR ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES AS BEING RESPONSIBLE FOR EVALUATION AND/OR DISTRIBUTION OF SUPPLEMENTARY FREE MATERIALS - 1965 AND 1970

Response	Year	f	Per Cent of Respondents Answering*	Per Cent of Total Replies**
Principal	1965	12	33.33	11.54
	1970	9	36.00	8.11
Committees	1965	8	22.22	7.69
	1970	3	12.00	2.70
Teachers	1965	6	16.67	5.77
	1970	5	20.00	4.50
Superintendent and/or Staff	1965	5	13.89	4.81
	1970	10	40.00	9.01
Asst. Supt. for Instruction	1965	3	8.33	2.88
	1970	4	16.00	3.60
Librarians	1965	1	2.78	.96
	1970	2	8.00	1.80

** Total replies received, 1965 = 104
Total replies received, 1970 = 111

* Written policy statements received, 1965 = 36
Written policy statements received, 1970 = 25

while in others no clear delineation of responsibility was noted. As with other data presented in relation to these written policy statements all classification determinations were made subjectively, following a careful reading and evaluation of each written statement. Data classification relating to these policies are presented in Table 8.

Data are presented in Table 9 showing the criteria which were reported by the superintendents for determining the acceptability of supplementary free materials for classroom use. Only two of the fourteen different criteria mentioned by the superintendents who responded to the question occurred on more than half of the responses in both the 1965 and the 1970 studies. The most frequently used response was "Appropriate to school purposes," while the second most frequently occurring response was "free of advertising." These responses obtained in both studies, however the frequency of response was diminished over the five year period.

Of particular interest in the comparison of the two studies was the increase in the following categories: "decision left to teachers", "free from bias", "supplementary to existing materials", and "authenticity". These data tend to agree with those data reported in Table 4 (pages 22 and 23) and Tables 6 and 7 (pages 26 and 27).

TABLE 9. CRITERIA USED IN DETERMINING THE ACCEPTABILITY OF SUPPLEMENTARY FREE MATERIALS FOR CLASSROOM USE - 1965 AND 1970

Response	Year	f	Per Cent of Respondents Answering*	Per Cent of Total Replies**
Appropriate to School Purposes	1965	47	74.60	45.19
	1970	46	61.33	41.44
Free of (objectionable) Advertising	1965	38	60.32	36.54
	1970	44	58.67	39.64
Educational Value to Teachers	1965	20	31.75	19.23
	1970	16	21.33	14.41
Decision Left to Teachers	1965	7	11.11	6.75
	1970	16	21.33	14.41
Free from bias	1965	7	11.11	6.75
	1970	13	17.33	11.71
Useful	1965	3	4.76	2.88
	1970	8	10.67	7.21
Attractiveness	1965	3	4.76	2.88
	1970	3	4.00	2.70
Supplementary to existing materials	1965	2	3.17	1.92
	1970	12	16.00	10.81
Authorship shown	1965	2	3.17	1.92
	1970	2	2.67	1.80
Authenticity	1965	2	3.17	1.92
	1970	10	13.33	9.01
No Restrictions on Use Imposed	1965	1	1.59	.96
	1970	2	2.67	1.80
Non-controversial	1965	1	1.59	.96
	1970	4	5.33	3.60

TABLE 9. (Continued)

Response	Year	f	Per Cent of Respondents Answering*	Per Cent of Total Replies**
Limited to non-profit sources	1965	1	1.59	.96
	1970	1	1.33	.90
No universally agreed upon criteria exist	1965	1	1.59	.96
	1970	4	5.33	3.60
No response	1965	12	--.--	11.54
	1970	15	--.--	13.51
Referred to Board Policy	1965	19	--.--	18.27
	1970	21	--.--	18.92

* Total replies received less(No response + Referred to Board Policy) = Respondents Answering
1965 = 104 - (12+19) = 73
1970 = 111 - (15+21) = 75

** Total replies received, 1965 = 104
Total replies received, 1970 = 111

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purposes of this chapter were to present: (1) a summary of the problem and the procedures used; (2) a summary of the findings of both investigations; (3) the major conclusions; and (4) the major recommendations for further study.

I. SUMMARY

Review of the problem. It was the purpose of this study to investigate the school board policies and administrative procedures for dealing with supplementary free materials in all cities in the United States of 100,000 or more population. The study was first conducted in 1965 and replicated in 1970.

These studies specifically attempted to determine, and compare where applicable: (1) the existence of board policies, both written and unwritten, which dealt with supplementary free materials; (2) the procedures and criteria used in the selection and evaluation of these materials; (3) the person(s) and/or group(s) responsible for the determination of the acceptability and the distribution of these supplementary free materials.

Corollary information was also gathered concerning the effect of a follow-up letter on returns.

This study was intended to add to the body of knowledge concerned with board policies and administrative procedures used in dealing with supplementary free materials.

Design of the study. Data for the original and the replication studies were collected as follows:

1. All cities of 100,000 or more population were listed and the superintendents of the school systems in these cities were contacted, using a questionnaire designed to elicit responses dealing with board policies in their respective school systems relating to supplementary free materials.

2. The data from the analysis of these questionnaires were tabulated and reported as: the per cent of responses to the questionnaires received by population size of the city; (2) the existence of board policies dealing with supplementary free materials; (3) the person(s) and/or group(s) responsible for the determination of the acceptability and distribution of these materials; and (4) the criteria used for determining the acceptability of these materials by the school districts.

II. SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

1. In 1965, 75 per cent of the responses indicated the existence of a board policy for dealing with supplementary free materials. By 1970 this percentage had diminished to 59 per cent. In both surveys only about half of the respondents indicated that this policy was a written one.

2. In 1965 over 90 per cent of the respondents indicated that their policy permitted the use of supplementary free materials. By 1970 this figure had grown to 93 per cent.

3. In 1965 the individual building principal was the individual most often designated as being responsible for determining the acceptability of supplementary free materials and for their distribution to individual teachers. In the 1970 replication the individual teacher was the person most often named (71 per cent), closely followed by the building principal (62 per cent). When the written board policies and administrative procedures submitted by some school districts (36 cases) were analyzed, the building principal was most often designated in 1965, but the superintendent and/or his staff was designated in 40 per cent of the cases (25 submitted) in the 1970 replication.

4. In both the statements of written board policies received and the listing of the criteria used in the evaluation of supplementary free materials, two factors were mentioned most often in both the 1965 study and the 1970 replication: (1) that the materials must be appropriate to school purposes, that is relevant to the curriculum and the subject being taught; and (2) that the materials should be free of (objectionable) advertising.

III. CONCLUSIONS

Four basic conclusions were drawn from the findings of this study:

1. On the basis of the replies received to the questionnaire, the use of supplementary free materials was permitted in over 90 per cent of the school districts. This was the policy and/or practice in 1965 and has continued through 1970. There is little to lead to the conclusion that it will change in the near future.

2. That while policies regarding supplementary free materials do exist in the school districts which responded to the questionnaire, much less than half of the policies in the respondent's districts are written.

3. There has been a shift from the building principal to the individual teacher in determining the acceptability of supplementary free materials. The major responsibility for the determination of acceptability and distribution now lies within the building (i.e. individual teacher and/or building principal). The role of the central office will be most frequently represented through the use of supervisory personnel.

4. There are many diverse criteria which are used in the determination of acceptability of supplementary free materials. Two criteria were identified with greater frequency than any others. These were: (1) that the materials

should be relevant to the instructional program and be educationally significant; and (2) that they must be free of (objectionable) advertising.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The findings, conclusions, and a review of the many aspects of the study and its replication, indicated that the following recommendations for further study should be considered.

1. That another replication of this study be considered in another five years.

2. There is a great need in the area of teacher utilization of supplementary free materials. Investigation in this area appears to be warranted in view of the fact that many considerations undoubtedly influence teachers in their use of these materials. While not all of these factors could be investigated simultaneously, it appears that a beginning should be made in an attempt to isolate pertinent variables.

3. Investigation should be made concerning the involvement of teachers in the production and evaluation of these materials.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. American Association of School Administrators. Choosing Free Materials for Use in the Schools. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators of the National Education Association, 1955.

2. American Association of School Administrators. School Boards in Action. Twenty-fourth Yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators of the National Education Association, 1946.

3. American Association of School Administrators. 1964 Roster of Members. Washington, D. C. American Association of School Administrators of the National Education Association, 1964.

4. American Association of School Administrators. 1970 Roster of Members. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1970.

5. Beuschlein, Muriel. "Free and Inexpensive Teaching Aids for Conservation Education." American Biology Teacher. XV (February, 1953), pp. 35-48.

6. Bretsch, Howard S. "Boards of Education," Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Third edition. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960. pp. 150-54.

7. Goldhammer, Keith. The School Board. The Library of Education Series. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.

8. Good, Carter V. (ed.). Dictionary of Education. Second edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959.

9. Greider, Calvin, Truman M. Pierce, and William Everett Rosenstengel. Public School Administration. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1961.

10. Information Please Almanac, Atlas, and Yearbook, 1965. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1964.

11. Jaynes, L. C. President, National Trailways Bus System, correspondence dated July 2, 1964.

12. Kenworthy, Leonard S. World Affairs Guides. New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, Teachers College, 1962, 1963.

13. Kinsey, Mark. Director, Americanism-Loyalty Day, Veterans of Foreign Wars, correspondence dated June 29, 1964.

14. Knezevich, Stephen J. Administration of Public Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.

15. Kurtz, Seymour (ed.). The New York Times Encyclopedic Almanac. New York: The New York Times Book and Educational Division, 1969.

16. Lawson, Douglas E. School Administration: Procedures and Practices. New York: The Odyssey Press, 1953.

17. Mertes, R. O., Director, School and College Service, United Airlines, correspondence dated June 29, 1964.

18. Moehlman, Arthur B. School Administration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951.

19. Mort, Paul R. and Donald H. Ross. Principles of School Administration. Second edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957.

20. National Science Teachers Association. How Science Teachers Use Business-Sponsored Teaching Aids. Washington, D.C.: Advisory Council on Industry-Science Teaching Relations of the NSTA of the National Education Association, 1950.

21. Pepe, Thomas J. Free and Inexpensive Educational Aids. Second Revised Edition. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1962.

22. Prentice-Hall Editorial Staff. School Executives Guide. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

23. Reeder, Ward G. The Fundamentals of Public School Administration. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941.

24. Sinclair, Thomas J. Business-Sponsored Teaching Aids. Dansville, New York: F. A. Owen Publishing Company, 1949.

25. Suttles, Patricia H. and John G. Fowlkes. Educators Grade Guide to Free Teaching Aids. Randolph, Wisconsin: Educators Progress Service (revised annually), 1964-70.

26. "Teachers Service Bureau," The Grade Teacher (monthly column).

27. United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Education Directory 1963-64, Part 2, Public School Systems. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1964.

28. United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Education Directory 1969-70, Part 2, Public School Systems. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1969.

29. Vauers, Roger. Director, Ambassade de France, correspondence dated July 2nd, 1964.

30. Wynn, D. Richard. Organization of Public Schools. The Library of Education Series. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

March 15, 1965

The Center for Educational Research and Service of Ohio University is conducting a survey of superintendents of schools of selected school systems of the United States concerning their policies in regard to the use of supplementary free materials within their school systems.

This survey is a part of the ongoing program of the Center for Educational Research and Service and is an attempt to determine current practices in use in selected school systems. Your participation in this study is requested.

Two copies of the questionnaire have been enclosed for your convenience. You may wish to retain the second copy for your files.

A summary of the results of this study will be sent you upon its completion.

Sincerely,

Charles R. DuVall
Research Fellow

Approved:

Samuel I. Hicks, Director
Center for Educational Research and Service

Encl.

APPENDIX A

OHIO UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND SERVICE
College of Education
Athens, Ohio 45701

Does your school district have a policy pertaining to the selection of supplementary free materials for classroom use by teachers?

___ Yes ___ No

Does your policy permit the use of such free materials by teachers with their classes?

___Yes ___ No

What person(s) or group(s) pass upon the acceptability of supplementary free materials?

___ Individual Teacher
___ Building Principal
___ Librarians
___ Building Curriculum Committee
___ Curriculum Supervisors
___ City-wide Curriculum Committee
___ Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
___ Other (please specify) _____

_____

_____

What are the criteria used for determining the acceptability of supplementary free materials for classroom use?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Supplementary free materials are obtained and distributed by:

___ Individual Teacher
___ Building Principal
___ Librarians
___ Building Curriculum Committee
___ Curriculum Supervisors
___ City-wide Curriculum Committee
___ Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
___ Other (please specify) _____

_____

_____

APPENDIX A

Is your policy concerning the selection and use of supplementary free materials a written policy?

___ Yes ___ No

If answer above is "yes" would you please enclose a copy of this policy with the questionnaire?

Please use this space for any additional remarks you would care to make concerning supplementary free materials.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

. . . . . .

A summary of the results of this study will be sent to you when the study is completed.

NAME _____

SCHOOL SYSTEM _____

ADDRESS _____

. . . . . .

Please return to:

Charles R. DuVall
Center for Educational
Research and Service
College of Education
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio 45701

April 12, 1965

On March 15, 1965, you were sent a questionnaire as a part of a study to evaluate the policies of selected school systems of the United States concerning their use of supplementary free materials.

This survey is a part of the ongoing program of the Center for Educational Research and Service of Ohio University. It is an attempt to determine current practices in use in selected school systems. Your participation in this study is requested.

If you have not yet responded please consider that the successful completion of this study has great potential value to educators and students. Thus we are particularly anxious to receive replies from a representative sample of school systems. If you are able to complete and return the questionnaire it will be of great value.

In the event that you have misplaced the first questionnaire I have enclosed two additional copies of it. You may wish to retain the second copy for your files. A stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

A summary of the results of this study will be sent you upon its completion.

Sincerely,

Charles R. DuVall
Research Fellow

Approved:

Samuel I. Hicks, Director
Center for Educational Research and Service

Encl.

APPENDIX A

INDIANA UNIVERSITY at SOUTH BEND
1825 NORTHSIDE BOULEVARD
SOUTH BEND, INDIANA 46615
TEL. NO. 219—282-2341

47.

May 8, 1970

Dear Superintendent:

I am conducting a survey of all school districts of metropolitan areas of 100,000 or more population in the United States to determine their school policies regarding classroom use of free and inexpensive materials (i.e., pamphlets, films, etc.).

It is hoped that this study will contribute to the body of knowledge regarding the current policies and practices for dealing with these materials. Your participation in this study is requested. Your district will not be identified by name in the study, only an analysis of the responses and materials provided will be made.

Two copies of the opinionnaire have been enclosed for your convenience. You may wish to retain the second copy for your files.

A summary of the results of this study will be sent you upon its completion. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Charles R. DuVall
Assistant Professor of Education

APPENDIX A

INDIANA UNIVERSITY AT SOUTH BEND
Division of Education
South Bend, Indiana 46615

POLICY:

Does your school system have a policy pertaining to the selection of supplementary free materials for classroom use by teachers?

_____ Yes _____ No

Does your policy permit the use of such free materials by teachers with their classes?

_____ Yes _____ No

Is this policy written? _____ Yes _____ No

If answer to above is "yes" please enclose a copy of this written policy with your reply, if readily available.

PROCEDURES:

Which person(s) or group(s) pass upon the acceptability of supplementary free materials?

_____ Individual teacher
_____ Building Principal
_____ Building Librarians
_____ Building Curriculum Committee
_____ Curriculum Supervisors
_____ City-wide Curriculum Committee
_____ Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
_____ Other (please specify) _____

_____

What are the criteria used for determining the acceptability of supplementary free materials for classroom use?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Supplementary free materials can be obtained and distributed by:

_____ Individual teacher
_____ Building Principal
_____ Building Librarians
_____ Building Curriculum Committee
_____ Curriculum Supervisors
_____ City-wide Curriculum Committee
_____ Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
_____ Other (Please specify) _____

_____

APPENDIX A

Please use this space for any additional remarks you care to make concerning supplementary free materials:

* * * \

APPENDIX B

COPY

NATIONAL TRAILWAYS BUS SYSTEM

L. C. JAYNES
PRESIDENT

SUITE 803
1012 14TH STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON 5, D. C.
NATIONAL 8-6534

July 2, 1964

JUL - 6 REC'D

Mr. Charles R. Du Vall
20 Pomeroy Road
Athens, Ohio 45701

Dear Mr. Du Vall:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 26th, in which you asked for information as to the names of teachers requesting our Trailways Teachers Kit.

Under separate cover I am forwarding you a copy of our Trailways Teachers Kit. This kit is provided free of charge to teachers requesting it. We have approximately 10,000 requests annually for these kits. Therefore, we do not keep a record of the names and addresses of teachers requesting it.

With every good wish to you on the success of your project, I am

Sincerely,

L. C. Jaynes
Major General, USA, Ret.

LCJ/fme

APPENDIX B
COPY

V F W VETERANS OF F( )F THE UNITED STATES 51.

MARK KINSEY, DIRECTOR
AMERICANISM, LOYALTY DAY

June 29, 1964

JUL 2 RECD JUL 2 RECD

Charles R. DuVall
Box 30, McCracken Hall
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio 45701

Dear Mr. Duvall:

Answering your June 27 form letter:

We appreciate the probable value of your interesting survey. We can foresee that some of the conclusions derived therefrom might be highly beneficial to educational planning generally.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has for several years offered teachers in public and parochial schools and colleges single free copies of certain items they've requested to supplement their instruction. The accompanying articles show you the type offered. Most of them are listed in nine teachers guides.

Approximately 700 teachers each month through the year ask for some or all of the V.F.W. Americanism items. We send them. Some teachers, schools and school systems have subsequently requested certain articles in quantities -- presumably for their pupils. In such instances we endeavor to make the materials available through the cooperation of our local units -- V.F.W. Posts and Ladies Auxiliaries.

It is against the policy of our organization to provide mailing lists to anyone -- either within or outside the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Even if the Americanism Department were permitted to give you the names of all the teachers corresponding with us their numbers would be greater than our limited staff could handle.

Let us know if we can help you in any other way.

Sincerely

Mark Kinsey, Director
Americanism - Loyalty Day

MK:R
Enc.

COPY

52.

APPENDIX B

UNITED AIR LINES

P.O. Box 8800, O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois 60666 Location: 1200 Algonquin Road, Elk Grove Township, Illinois Phone 625-1400

EXECUTIVE OFFICES

June 29, 1964

JUL 1 REC'D

Mr. Charles R. DuVall
Box 30, McCracken Hall
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio 45701

Dear Mr. DuVall:

Yours is a most interesting project - and, under separate cover we are forwarding a complete set of our materials as indicated in the enclosed order form. It will be impossible to give you respective letters - we receive upwards of 80,000 each year requesting our materials - and, these automatically go to our mailing lists for filling of requests, etc. Should we be able to offer you some of these letters, under our present system, I will forward them at a later date.

May we wish you the best of success with your project.

Sincerely yours,

R. O. Mertes, Director
School and College Service

United Air Line's Rule of Five: safety·passenger comfort·schedule dependability·honesty·sincerity

APPENDIX B

COPY

53.

AMBASSADE DE FRANCE

972 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10021
REGENT 7-9700

SERVICE DE PRESSE
ET D'INFORMATION
No. 1317
MP/gv

July 2nd, 1964

JUL - 9 REC'D

Mr. Charles R. Duvall
Box 30, McCracken Hall
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio-45701

Dear Mr. Duvall:

We have received your letter of June 26 asking us for the list of teachers requesting our material on France.

We regret that we are unable to provide you with such a list. However, we are sending you, under separate cover, one of the teacher's kits that we distribute upon request. You may be interested to know that we have sent in 1963 more than 7.000 of these kits.

Sincerely yours,

Roger Vaurs
Director

END